

DOCKET NO. 01-P-002 (STMI01-00013)  
Customer No. 30425

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: : Charles R. Spinner, III, et al.  
Serial No. : 09/871,463  
Filed : May 31, 2001  
For : BARRIER FILM DEPOSITION OVER METAL FOR  
REDUCTION IN METAL DISHING AFTER CMP  
Group No. : 2815  
Examiner : M.E. Warren

BOX AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

FAX RECEIVED

MAR 19 2003

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION BY FACSIMILE TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Sir:

The undersigned hereby certifies that the following documents:

1. Petition Under 37 C.F.R. §1.144

relating to the above application was faxed to (703) 308-7722 on March 19, 2003.

Date:

3/19/03

Faxer

Kathy Longenecker

Date:

March 19, 2003

William A. Munck  
William A. Munck  
Reg. No. 39,308

P.O. Box 802432  
Dallas, Texas 75380  
Phone: (972) 628-3600  
Fax: (972) 628-3616  
E-mail: [wmunck@davismunck.com](mailto:wmunck@davismunck.com)

**DOCKET NO. 01-P-002 (STMI01-00013)**  
**Customer N . 30425**

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of: : CHARLES R. SPINNER, III ET AL  
Serial No. : 09/871,463  
Filed : May 31, 2001  
For : BARRIER FILM DEPOSITION OVER METAL FOR  
REDUCTION IN METAL DISHING AFTER CMP  
Group No. : 2815  
Examiner : M.E. Warren

**Box AF**  
**Commissioner for Patents**  
**Washington, D. C. 20231**

Sir:

**FAX RECEIVED**

**MAR 19 2003**

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**

**PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.144**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.144, and prior to entry of Applicant's Notice of Appeal, Applicant respectfully petitions from the Restriction Requirement mailed April 9, 2002.

Applicant traversed the Restriction Requirement in a response filed May 1, 2002, and requested reconsideration of the Restriction Requirement in a response filed February 19, 2003.

The Restriction Requirement restricted claims 1-7, drawn to a method of making a semiconductor device, from claims 8-20, drawn to a semiconductor device.

The Restriction Requirement asserts that the method claims (1-7) and the structure claims (8-20) are distinct because the structure of claims 8 and 16 may be manufactured by a

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 01-P-002 (STMI01-00013)  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/871,463  
PATENT

materially different process than that recited in claim 1. Specifically, the Restriction Requirement asserts that the product and process are distinct because "etching, instead of chemical mechanical polishing, could be used to remove portions of the protective barrier layer."

Restriction is only proper where the claims are independent or distinct. MPEP § 806. In passing on questions of restriction, the claimed subject matter must be compared in order to determine distinctness and independence. MPEP § 806.01. In the present application, pending independent claim 8 does not require removal of any portion of the protective barrier layer. Instead, claim 8 reads on a structure prior to removal of portions of the protective barrier layer (by, preferably, chemical mechanical polishing). In addition, it is not apparent that the structure recited in pending independent claim 16 could be formed by etching rather than chemical mechanical polishing. Claim 16 recites a portion of a protective barrier layer over a central region of the tungsten and within the opening. Isotropic etching would uniformly remove a conformal protective barrier layer, while anisotropic etching for partial removal would remove the vertically thinner portions (e.g., at the center of an opening) leaving sidewalls alongside vertical or sloped surfaces. Neither type of etching would result in the structure recited in claim 16.

In addition, a process of making and the product made are distinct inventions only if: (A) the process as claimed is not an obvious process of making the product and can be used to make other and different products; and (B) the product as claimed can be made by another and

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 01-P-002 (STMI01-00013)  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/871,463  
PATENT


materially different process. The Restriction Requirement provides not basis for concluding that simple etching is materially different--i.e., patentably distinct--over chemical mechanical polishing.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: March 19, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William A. Munck  
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Box 802432  
Dallas, Texas 75380  
(972) 628-3600 (main number)  
(972) 628-3616 (fax)  
E-mail: [wmunck@davismunck.com](mailto:wmunck@davismunck.com)